

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
7  
8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
9

10 TATYANA EVGENIEVNA DREVALEVA,

11 Plaintiff,

No. C 18-03748 WHA

12 v.

13 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS  
14 AFFAIRS, et al.,

15 Defendants.  
16 \_\_\_\_\_/

**ORDER DENYING  
REQUEST TO FILE  
SUPPLEMENTAL  
BRIEFING**

17 In this *pro se* employment discrimination action, defendants filed a motion to dismiss  
18 pursuant to FRCP 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6). Plaintiff filed her opposition and defendants  
19 responded (Dkt. Nos. 40, 41). Plaintiff now requests leave to file supplemental briefing  
20 pursuant to Local Rule 7-3(d).


21 Local Rule 7-3(d) states, “[o]nce a reply is filed, no additional memoranda, papers,  
22 or letters may be filed with the court without prior approval” unless new evidence has been  
23 submitted in the reply or relevant judicial opinions were published after the reply or opposition  
24 was filed. Neither exception applies here.

25 Plaintiff alleges that defendants raised new issues in their reply that were not present  
26 in their motion to dismiss. Plaintiff, however, fails to identify these new issues and does not  
27 explain what information she found to be “misleading” in defendants’ reply (Dkt. No. 42 at 1).  
28 Plaintiff has already had the opportunity to present arguments and cite to case law in her

1 opposition and various other requests and motions she has submitted. The Court finds no basis  
2 for permitting additional briefing, thus, plaintiff's request for leave to file a supplemental brief is  
3 hereby **DENIED**.

4  
5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6  
7 Dated: November 2, 2018.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE